UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.usplo.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/742,346	12/19/2003	Robert Falotico	CRD-5062 USANP	6421
27777 PHILIP S. JOH	7590 02/02/201 NSON	EXAMINER		
JOHNSON & J	011110011	HELM, CARALYNNE E		
	N & JOHNSON PLAZ VICK, NJ 08933-7003	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			1615	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			02/02/2011	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

jnjuspatent@corus.jnj.com lhowd@its.jnj.com gsanche@its.jnj.com

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
10/742,346	FALOTICO ET AL.		
Examiner	Art Unit		
CARALYNNE HELM	1615		

L CA	DALTININE HELIVI	1015					
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears	on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence add	ress				
THE REPLY FILED <u>28 December 2010</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.							
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the sapplication, applicant must timely file one of the following replication in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (v for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR periods:	es: (1) an amendment, affidavit vith appeal fee) in compliance v	, or other evidence, with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request				
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing date							
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Adviso no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later the Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b).	nan SIX MONTHS from the mailing	date of the final rejection	n.				
MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).							
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on whave been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shorteset forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	n and the corresponding amount o ned statutory period for reply origin	f the fee. The appropria ally set in the final Offic	ate extension fee e action; or (2) as				
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in complianc	e with 37 CFR 41.37 must be fi	iled within two months	of the date of				
filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within AMENDMENTS	thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the					
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but p	rior to the date of filing a brief.	will not be entered be	cause				
(a) They raise new issues that would require further consider			04400				
(b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);	•	,,					
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in better for appeal; and/or			ne issues for				
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a corre	sponding number of finally reje	cted claims.					
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).							
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. S		npliant Amendment (I	PTOL-324).				
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):							
6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowal non-allowable claim(s).							
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) whow the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: 6-8. Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:		be entered and an ex	xplanation of				
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE							
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and suff was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 							
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a No entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overce showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and	ome <u>all</u> rejections under appea	l and/or appellant fails	s to provide a				
10. \square The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of t REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	he status of the claims after en	try is below or attache	ed.				
11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:							
12. Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i> (s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)13. Other: See Continuation Sheet.							
T							
/Caralynne Helm/	/Juliet C Switzer/	Translation I					
Examiner, Art Unit 1615	Primary Examiner, Art Ui	nit 1634					

Continuation of 13. Other:

For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s) will be entered and the proposed rejection(s) detailed below will be included in the Examiner's Answer. To be complete, such rejection(s) must be addressed in any brief on appeal.

Upon entry of the amendment(s) for purposes of appeal: Claims 6-7 would be rejected for the reasons set forth in the rejection under 35 USC 103(a) over Tseng et al. in view of Windecker et al. and Roorda et al. of the final Office action mailed October 28, 2010 while claims 6 and 8 would be rejected under 35 USC 103(a) over Tseng et al. in view of Windecker et al., Roorda et al. and Carter et al. of the same Office action. In addition, applicants teach that a BMA topcoat and PVDF-HFP basecoat are incompatible polymers and that this incompatibility allows the topcoat of acrylic polymer to act as both a chemical and physical barrier (see instant specification page 123). As the rejections, detail, the cited references render obvious such a coating with these two particular polymers and the recited trichostatin A and rapamycin. Consequently, it would be a necessary property of the resulting coating that it would also have a topcoat and basecoat that are chemically incompatible that create a chemical and physical barrier to elution of the trichostatin A and rapamycin.

Applicants argue that there are no blends in the coatings of the claims; however the components of the coating layers are written with open claim language. Thus the coatings are not limited to a single polymer and also embrace blends.